



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/511,248	10/13/2004	William K. S. Cleveland	3238-01	8874
26645	7590	11/24/2010		
The Lubrizol Corporation 29400 Lakeland Blvd. Wickliffe, OH 44092-2298			EXAMINER	
			VASISTH, VISHAL V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1771	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/24/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/511,248

Applicant(s)

CLEVELAND ET AL.

Examiner

VISHAL VASISTH

Art Unit

1771

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 September 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1.5.6.8.10 and 12-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1.5.6.8.10 and 12-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicants' submission filed on 9/28/2010 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicants' response filed 9/28/2010 amended independent claim 1 and cancelled claims 3 and 7. Neither applicants' arguments nor amendments addressed below overcome the 35 USC 103 rejection over Blythe in view of Patel further in view of Teacherson from the office action mailed on 1/29/2010, therefore this rejection is maintained below and incorporated herein by reference.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims 1, 5-6, 8, 10 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blythe, US Patent No. 5,264,005 (hereinafter referred to as Blythe) in view of Patel et al., US Patent No. 5,741,764 (hereinafter referred to as Patel) further in view of Teacherson, US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0083729 (hereinafter referred to as Teacherson).

The rejection from Paragraph 6 of office action mailed on 1/29/2010 is maintained and incorporated herein by reference.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicants' arguments filed on 9/28/2010 regarding claims 1, 5-6, 8, 10 and 12-14 have been fully considered and are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that the amendments to independent claim 1 are sufficient to demonstrate that the claims are now commensurate in scope with the data from the specification and the data presented in the Declaration signed by Laimute Svarcas on 9/28/2010 and that this data demonstrates that the example oil compositions show unexpected results.

There are, however still two issues that the examiner has with the claims as instantly recited. Firstly, the concentration of B(1) in the instant claims is from 1.6 to 3.4 wt%. This range is still too broad because as can be seen from Example H in the declaration when compared to comparative example J that increasing the concentration of B(1) actually produces worse results in terms of Undercrown Rating. The upper limit of the concentration range at 3.4 wt% is actually closer to the 4 wt% of the comparative example J than it is to the 2 wt% of B(1) in Example H. Therefore, it is very difficult for the examiner to determine at which concentration point/range that the results are still good in terms of Undercrown rating. It would be helpful if applicants discussed what were superior Undercrown ratings as applicants presented for power valve ratings.

Secondly, the examiner is of the position that the concentration range of components B(1) + B(2) of 5.5 to 15 wt% is still too broad when considered in light of the example formulations of the instant specification and the declaration. This range has been narrowed somewhat due to upper limits placed on component B(2) but the same limiting factors should be present for component B(1).

The reasons stated above show that applicants have not demonstrated unexpected results across the full scope of the claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VISHAL VASISTH whose telephone number is (571)270-3716. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R 8:30a-5:30p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on (571)272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

VVV

/Glenn A Caldarola/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 1771